UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

District of New Mexico

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA V.

Judgment in a Criminal Case

(For **Revocation** of Probation or Supervised Release)

Rosendo Martinez-Osuna

Case Number: 2:08CR02922-001JB

USM Number: 31742-008

Defense Attorney: Roger Finzel, Appointed

THE DEFENDA	ANT:	Defense Automey. Roger Finzer, Appointed
_	uilt to violations of condition(s) MC of the term in violation of condition(s) after denial of guilt	
The defendant is	s adjudicated guilty of these violations:	
Violation	Nature of Violation	Violation Ended
Number I	Mandatory Condition - The defendant commilocal crime.	tted another federal, state, or 08/18/2008
The defendant is Act of 1984.	s sentenced as provided in pages 1 through 2 of the	nis judgment. The sentence is imposed pursuant to the Sentencing Reform
☐ The defend	lant has not violated condition(s) and is dischar	ged as to such violation(s).
	•	e United States attorney for this district within 30 days of any change of osts, and special assessments imposed by this judgment are fully paid.
		March 20, 2009
Defendant's Soc	c. Sec. No.	Date of Imposition of Judgment
02/16/1968		/s/ James O. Browning
Defendant's Da	te of Birth	Signature of Judge
Calle Aguascalientes 81 Sur Esperanza, Sonora MX		Honorable James O. Browning United States District Judge
Defendant's Residence Address		
		Name and Title of Judge
		Name and Title of Judge
		Name and Title of Judge March 24, 2009
Defendant's Ma	sidence Address	
Defendant's Ma	sidence Address	March 24, 2009

AO 245D (Rev. 12/03) Judgment in a Criminal Case for Revocations

Sheet 2 Imprisonment Judgment Page 2 of 2

Defendant: **Rosendo Martinez-Osuna** Case Number: **2:08CR02922-001JB**

IMPRISONMENT

The defendant is committed to the custody of the United States Bureau of Prisons to be imprisoned for a total term of 12 months.

Said term shall run concurrent to the sentence imposed in 2:08CR02263-001JB.

Though advisory, the Court has considered the Guidelines and, in arriving at its sentence, has taken account of the Guidelines with other sentencing goals. Specifically, the Court has considered the Guidelines` sentencing range established for the applicable category of offense committed by the applicable category of Defendant. The Court believes that the Guidelines` punishment is appropriate for this sort of offense. Therefore, the sentence in this judgment is consistent with a guideline sentence. The Court has considered the kind of sentence and range established by the Guidelines. The Court believes that a sentence of 12 months reflects the seriousness of the offense, promotes respect for the law, provides just punishment, affords adequate deterrence, protects the public and effectively provides the Defendant with needed education or vocational training and medical care, and otherwise fully reflects each of the factors embodied in 18 U.S.C. Section 3553(a). The Court also believes the sentence is reasonable. The Court believes the sentence is sufficient, but not greater than necessary, to comply with the purposes set forth in the Sentencing Reform Act.

×	The court makes these recommendations to the Bureau of Prisons:	
	The Court recommends the Defendant receive credit toward the sentence imposed from the date of the filing of the Pergiving rise to this matter, which was November 5, 2008.	tition
	The defendant is remanded to the custody of the United States Marshal. The defendant must surrender to the United States Marshal for this district: at on as notified by the United States Marshal. The defendant must surrender for service of sentence at the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons: before 2 p.m. on as notified by the United States Marshal as notified by the Probation or Pretrial Service Office.	
	RETURN	
I hav	ve executed this judgment by:	
Defei	endant delivered ontotothe a Certified copy of this judgment.	
	UNITED STATES MARSHAL	

Case 2:08-cr-02922-JB Document 15 Filed 03/24/09 Page 3 of 3

Deputy United States Marshal